DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 523 EA 021 047

AUTHOR Louden, L. W.; Browne, R. K.
TITLE Developments in Education Policy in the Eighties: Trends in Three Federal Systems: Australia, Canada, and the U.S.A. An Australian Perspective.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Policy; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Government; Federal Programs; Federal Regulation; *Federal State Relationship; Foreign Countries; *Government School Relationship; *State Legislation
IDENTIFIERS *Australia

ABSTRACT

The developments that have occurred in Australia s a result of both federal and state initiative are traced, especially those which occurred during the 1980s. Initially, constitutional arrangements, as they relate to education, are briefly described. A brief overview of recent policy developments is then provided. Some explanatory comments are offered, based on how the developments relate to broader social goals; the developments are then considered in the context of federal/state relations. The final section is devoted to outlining lessons from the Australian experience and some tentative suggestions on future directions are stated. (25 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309523

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION 1989 ANNUAL MEETING

THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1989

SAN FRANCISCO

Symposium

DEVELOPMENTS IN EDUCATION POLICY IN THE EIGHTIES

TRENDS IN THREE FEDERAL SYSTEMS

AUSTRALIA, CANADA AND THE U.S.A.

AN AUSTRALIAN PERSPECTIVE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. W. Louden

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dr L W Louden
Chief Executive Officer
Western Australian Ministry of Education

Dr R K Browne
Secretary
Australian Education Council

EA 021 047

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OVERVIEW

Although under the Australian Constitution the Federal Government has no responsibility for education, it has progressively assumed an important role in all areas of education.

This paper looks in some detail at education in schools. It traces developments which have occurred as a result of both Federal and State initiatives, especially those which have occurred during the 1980's.

The history of Federal Government involvement in schooling extends over 25 years. This time span may be divided into four periods. In the first, the Federal Government assisted State and independent school authorities by providing science laboratories and libraries. It did not concern itself with what went on in schools.

The second period began in the late 1960's when grants were made to non-government schools to cover part of their recurrent expenditure.

In the third period, beginning in 1973, a representative national body, the Schools Commission, took a direct role in what happened in schools through the provision of general recurrent and specific purpose funding designed to achieve some measure of equity between diverse groups in the nation.

In the fourth, and as yet incomplete period, the Federal Government which provides, directly, less than 10% of the funding of Government schools seeks to influence, strongly, what is happening in schools across Australia through the adoption by States of national goals for schooling, a common national curriculum framework and national reporting.

These increasingly pervasive Federal initiatives are set against economic, educational and social pressures within and between States which retain constitutional responsibility but are heavily dependent on the Federal Government's 10% contribution to the cost of providing schooling.

DEVELOPMENTS IN EDUCATION POLICY IN THE EIGHTIES

AN AUSTRALIAN PERSPECTIVE

The importance of a 'good education' is one of the most widely held beliefs in Australian society. As a result, in every State election political parties make much of their education policies. To a very significant extent, however, Australian schooling has been influenced more in the past 15 years by Federal Government policies than by the States. What makes this interesting is that the Federal Government has no constitutional power over education and provides directly less than 10% of the funding of government schools. This presentation reviews developments in education policy at the school level and identifies the pressures, both intrinsic and extrinsic to the individual State systems, which have operated during the past decade.

Initially, constitutional arrangements, as they relate to education, are briefly described. An overview of recent policy developments is then provided which, due to time constraints, has not been placed in any more than brief historical perspective. Some explanatory comments are offered, based on how the developments relate to broader social goals; the developments are then considered in the context of Federal/State relations, an aspect often overlooked by commentators on education policy. The final section is devoted to outlining lessons from the Australian experience and some tentative suggestions on future directions are stated.

Constitutional Responsibility for Education

Education Before Federation

Prior to Federation Australia consisted of six self-governing States which united to form the Commonwealth of Australia.

It is important to note that all of the States had, until relatively recently, been colonies of the United Kingdom and thus shared a common cultural background. In each of the States a system of free and compulsory education for at least all pupils of primary school age had been set up although these were of fairly recent origin. If, at the time of Federation, a decision to make education a responsibility of the Federal Government had been taken, it would have been a relatively simple matter to reconcile the minor differences which existed at that time. This did not occur and as a result six different systems became entrenched and remain so to this time. Despite the independent approaches there was a good deal of similarity. In general, one of two models had been followed. New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania opted for 6 years of primary education followed by up to 6 years of secondary education. The other States followed a model based on 7 years of primary followed by up to 5 years of secondary education. The age at which children began schooling also varied.

Despite these differences their common background ensured that there was a good deal of curriculum commonality between States although there were differences in emphasis and approaches. This situation has persisted to the present. Even though there is an Australian Education Council of which all ministers are members and frequent meetings of senior staff until recently there has been little co-operative interaction and control of education has been a jealously guarded State's right.

The Australian Constitution

On January 1, 1901 the State federated to form the Commonwealth of Australia. Like the United States, Australia has a written constitution. The basis of the Australian Constitution was that, for the most part, the existing Constitution of each State should continue until it was altered (Section 106). Every power of the State was to continue unless it was exclusively vested in the Parliament of the Commonwealth or withdrawn from the Parliament of the State (Section 107).

To amend the Constitution the proposed changes must first be passed by both Houses of the Federal Parliament. If this condition is satisfied the proposed amendment must then be submitted as a referendum, at which, in a majority of the States, a majority of the electors must favour the change if the amendment is to be accepted (Section 128). Since 1901 only eight proposals for amendment have been passed and the substance of the Constitution remains much as it was in 1901.

The powers which were exclusively vested in the Commonwealth in 1901 were relatively limited. They are detailed in Section 51 of the Constitution. In summary, these powers (1) set up a common market between Australian States with free trade and a common external customs tariff (2) gave the Commonwealth control over Australia's relations with other nations e.g. defence, immigration and external affairs (3) gave the Commonwealth the power to levy taxation and "borrow on the public credit" of the Commonwealth.

While the Constitution does not give the Commonwealth any powers in respect of education, Section 51 XXIIIA which was inserted in 1946 allows the Commonwealth to provide a range of benefits among which are "benefits to students".

A unique feature of Federal-State relations in Australia arises from the Federal Government's position in regard to taxation. Under Section 51 (ii) of the Constitution the Commonwealth has the power to levy taxation "but so as not to discriminate between States or parts of States". States also have the constitutional power to levy taxes including direct income tax. During the Second World War, however, a system of Federal government levied uniform, pay-as-you-earn taxation, was voluntarily agreed by the States. This practice has continued so that all direct income tax is now paid to the Commonwealth. States then receive "grants" as appropriations from the Commonwealth Treasury. In addition, the Commonwealth Grants Commission (established under Section 96 of the Constitution which gives the Federal Parliament power to grant financial assistance as it sees fit) recommends additional funding to States which have circumstances which make the provision of government services more costly in some States than others. As a result, there is a levelling effect between States which allows all Governments to provide comparable levels of public services. The decisions concerning the distribution of these funds between different activities is a matter for decision by State governments. The result is to bring about considerable similarity between the per capita spending of States on the services they provide. In most Australian States education accounts for about one quarter of the State Government's expenditure.

The Development of Federal Involvement in Education Prior to 1980

Although there is no specific provision for Federal Government involvement in education such involvement has existed for many years. As long ago as 1951/1952 the Commonwealth began to assist with the recurrent expenditure of universities. Up to this time this had been entirely a State responsibility. Further direct involvement followed in 1958 when the Commonwealth assumed some responsibility for capital expenditure in universities.

There was no further expansion into education by the Federal Government until 1965 when a further significant change took place. In that year involvement with technical and further education began when funding was made available for capital works in technical colleges on an equal share basis with States.

Commonwealth involvement in education in schools

Non-government schools were the first schools in Australia and these have persisted to the present day. They may be divided into schools which charged substantial fees and parish schools conducted by Catholic school authorities, which charged low fees. These low fee schools were made possible by the availability of members of religious orders as teachers. There was no direct financial support from government for these schools by either the Commonwealth or State governments.

Following the Second World War pressure began to build on Catholic schools as population growth from natural increase and migration greatly increased the numbers of students seeking places.

At first this increase was accommodated by increasing the size of classes. In Western Australia, for example, in Catholic primary schools pupil teacher ratios rose from 25:1 in 1940 to 38:1 in 1960. Continuing demand and a reduction in recruitment into the vocations, however, posed massive financial problems and consequent agitation for government aid to non-government schools.

Government aid for non government schools had been part of the platform of the Australian Labor party. In 1955 there was a major split in the Labor Party largely on religious grounds. As a result, in 1957, this plank of platform was removed. Both Federal and State Labor governments were bound by this ruling.

The Labor Party decision, together with increased demand for education in Catholic schools led the issue of government assistance for non-government schools to become an important political issue. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Liberal-Country Party Government late in 1963 promised, if returned in the impending election, to take steps to improve facilities in both government and non-government schools. The Government was duly returned.

The first step in Federal support for both government and non-government schools was the provision of funds to construct high quality science laboratories in secondary schools. The justification was the government's belief that it was essential to improve science facilities if Australia was to train scientists and technologists. Initially, funds were distributed to government and non-government schools according to enrolments. However, by 1967 the amount of money made available to non-government schools had doubled. The justification was that there were 'particular needs' in the non-government sector.

This was the first time that a 'needs' basis was applied by the Federal authority to the provision of funding for education.

The effect of this change in policy was that by 1971 (i.e. after the scheme had been in operation for seven years) the non-government sector which at that time enrolled less than 25% of secondary school students had received some 37% of Commonwealth funding.

At the secondary school level as the science laboratory programme was moving towards completion the Commonwealth announced its intention of providing funds to raise the standard of secondary school libraries in government and non-government schools. The purpose of this programme was clearly described as to develop "... a modern school library as a centre of learning in which a wide range of resource materials ... is available" (Commonwealth Department of Education Annual Report 1967/1968 p.28). To some extent this statement indicated a slightly changed direction by the Commonwealth. Up to this time money had been made available and apart from specification of the standard of buildings to be constructed, no directions to schools or education authorities had been issued. The decision to build libraries with a range of resources indicated a preference for discovery learning as a methodology and a multi-media approach as being necessary. This was not a widely accepted philosophy at that time. The Commonwealth Secondary Library Programme was important also because members of the committee visited non-government schools and made reports on the adequacy or otherwise of the buildings and learning resources available in these schools. As a result of these visits a picture of Australia's secondary schools began to be visible to Federal Government authorities.

Per Capita Grants to Non-government Schools

Perhaps the most important decision on education made by the Liberal-Country Party Government in the 1960's was to provide per capita grants to non-government schools to assist with recurrent expenditure. Prior to this, all grants had been associated with the funding of capital works or resources or went directly to parents through scholarships. There had been no contribution towards the recurrent costs associated with providing schooling. This changed in 1969. The initial per capita grants were modest, $35 per annum for primary pupils and $50 per annum for secondary students. These grants were not made to government schools.

Since the Constitution did not allow the Commonwealth to make direct grants to non-government schools, the grants were made to the State authorities on condition that they would be passed on to the individual non-government schools. For their part, the States were to require the school authorities to enter into an agreement with the State that they would use the money for the purpose for which it was approved. States were willing to accept these conditions since it reduced the demands upon them by non-government schools seeking assistance.

The State Aid Controversy

The provision of State aid for non-government schools was bitterly opposed by government school teachers' unions and parent groups. They claimed that the Government's responsibility was towards government schools. In view of this they insisted that no State aid should be made available until conditions were improved in government schools. They also argued that such aid was unconstitutional. Up to 1967 this group had the support of the opposition Labor Party. However, since there was a significant political disadvantage involved in opposing state-aid for non-government schools, the Labor Party's platform was changed and State aid for non-government schools became the policy of all major political parties.

A constitutional challenge was later mounted through the Courts by a group known as DOGS (Defence of Government Schools). The grounds were that such aid was not consistent with the Constitution Section 96 "... the Parliament may grant financial assistance to the States on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit" and section 116. "The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion or for imposing any religious observance....". In the latter case parallels were drawn between Section 116 and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It was contended that the words "a law for" were to the same effect as "a law in respect of" and pointed to the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which had the effect that Governments could not pass laws which aided one religion or all religions or preferred one religion to another.

The High Court by a majority of six to one dismissed the suit of the plaintiffs and, with its constitutional validity established and acceptance of State-aid as a plank of platform of all major political parties, State aid had clearly come to stay in Australian education.

Federal Government Influence on Education in The 1970's

While the Federal Government was now involved in all aspects of education, its influence in government schools had been limited to the provision of science laboratories in the period 1964-1971 and of school libraries from 1968.

The late 1960's and early 1970's was a period of growth in the size of the school population in Australia. Between 1966 and 1971 there was an increase of over 8% in the number of children in the age range over which schooling was compulsory. This led to problems in both the government and non-government sector for capital funds to provide new places.

Approaches by both State and non-government schools for capital aid for both primary and secondary schools led to the decision by the Federal Government to provide such aid and the States Grants (Schools) Act 1972 made funding available. The allocation to the sectors reflected the respective enrolments in each.

At the same time, the per capita aid to non-government schools which had been introduced by the Commonwealth in 1969 was increased to 20% of the cost of educating a child in a government school. The Commonwealth also indicated to States that they would be expected to match this amount.

The outcome of these evolutionary changes was that during the period 1951-1972 during which period a conservative government had been in power, the Commonwealth, which had no constitutional responsibility for education, had advanced to the situation where in 1971/1972 it was providing $161 million for universities and university student assistance; $65 million for colleges of advanced education and technical education; and $50 million for primary and secondary schools of which $32 million went to the non-government schools.

While during its term of office the government had greatly increased its influence on education, this was almost entirely confined to financial involvement. It appeared not to wish to affect what was happening in schools nor is there evidence that it saw education as being a central plank of government policy. Because of this "hands-off" policy the constitutional responsibilities of State Governments were not threatened and the Commonwealth's involvement was welcomed.

Revolutionary change - the Schools Commission

In December 1972 the Liberal-Country Party Government which had held office since 1949 was defeated by the Labor Party led by E.C. (Gough) Whitlam.

The Labor Party had been in opposition for well over twenty years. It was to be expected that there would be major changes upon its assumption of office.

The Labor Party in Australia is, traditionally, the party of the working class. Its view has always been that education is an important means of reducing inequities due to socio-economic factors. Thus equal opportunity of education for all has been a key plank of the Labor platform. Given this belief it was to be expected that education would assume a high profile once the party achieved government. This importance was reflected in the selection, as Minister for Education, of Kim Beazley, one of the longest serving members of parliament. He had been elected to Federal Parliament in 1945, and was highly regarded as an intellectual who had the respect of all parties.

One of the first actions of the new government was to announce the formation of an Australian Schools Commission. An interim committee under the chairmanship of a distinguished academic, Professor Peter Karmel, was appointed to "examine the position of government and non-government primary and secondary schools throughout Australia and to make recommendations on the immediate financial needs of those schools, the priorities within those needs and the measures appropriate to assist in meeting them". (Australian Schools Commission 1973 p.3 et seq.). This term of reference was consistent with the previous role of the Federal Government in Australian education. However, there were several further important terms of reference which broke new ground. The first required the committee to establish "acceptable standards for those schools, government and non-government alike, which fall short of those standards". There was an important implication in this term of reference. Instead of Federal assistance for education being granted to States to supplement their funding, the Commonwealth wished to set standards towards which it would work.

A second term of reference required the Interim Committee to take account of "the particular needs of schools for the handicapped... and of isolated children". It was clear that the government wished to base its programme on attempting to target those whose needs were greatest i.e. those who suffered the greatest educational disadvantage.

The third term of reference of great significance required the committee to take into account "the diversity of curricula to meet differing aptitudes and interests of the students". In posing this term of reference it was clear that, for the first time, a Federal Government was to be interested in what happened in schools as well as with their funding.

Finally, the terms of reference stated that additional funding would be made available by the Commonwealth, with effect from January 1, 1974, but that the funding was not in substitution for funds provided by State Governments or private school authorities. These authorities would be required to maintain their efforts.

The committee worked quickly and its report "Schools in Australia" was available in May.

The 'Karmel Report'

Since its publication in 1973 Schools in Australia has been referred to as the Karmel Report.

The report was based on six main values. The first was acceptance of devolution of authority. Most Australian State systems at that time were highly centralized. The committee, however, favoured "less rather than more centralized control over the operation of schools" (ASC 1973 p.10). This view required that the Schools Commission, when it began operation, should not follow a policy of central control but should establish guidelines and give schools freedom within these boundaries.

The second value was equality. The view was taken that all children, irrespective of their parents income or of their own ability, should have the opportunity to receive an appropriate education of quality.

The third value was diversity. This diversity included both different teaching methods and diversity in the nature of relationships between teachers and pupils.

The fourth value embraced was acceptance of the dual system of government and non-government schools. This was still an issue of conflict in the Australian community even though it had ceased to be a political issue.

The fifth value was the acceptance of community involvement in schooling. Government schools in most States tended to be isolated from their communities. The Interim Committee, however, believed meaningful involvement of the community to be essential if education was to receive parental acceptance and support.

Finally, the committee affirmed the special role of schools in assisting young people towards "the acquisition of skills and knowledge, initiation into the cultural heritage, the valuing of rationality and the broadening of opportunities to respond to and participate in artistic endeavours". Despite this affirmation of the traditional role of schools (ASC 1973 p.14), it accepted that schools now had an expanded social role over that which had existed previously.

The 'Karmel' Recommendations

The Karmel committee highlighted a number of deficiencies in Australian education. These included an overall lack of resources with great inequities between schools, many inadequately trained teachers, a relatively narrow curriculum with little provision for individual differences and an "authoritarian and hierarchical atmosphere" (ASC 1973 p.139) which inhibited human relationships.

Despite these inadequacies the committee recognized the need to operate through the various educational authorities if changes were to be made. It proposed that funds should be made available in the form of block grants which schools and school systems would be free to spend in accordance with their own preferences. It was further proposed that to begin rectifying the inequities which existed, schools and systems should receive differential grants but that all schools should achieve minimum acceptable standards by the end of the decade.

The committee recommended seven main programmes covering general recurrent resources, general buildings, primary and secondary libraries, disadvantaged schools, teacher development and innovation. These programmes in total were calculated to cost $467 million in 1974 and 1975 of which almost 90% was to go to government schools. This was in addition to the existing $195 million most of which went to non-government schools. Overall, about 28% of funds were to go to non-government schools.

The Interim Committee recommended the structure of the Schools Commission which was to be formed. It proposed several full-time commissioners together with six part-time commissioners drawn from the widest possible cross-section of the educational community. Subsequent appointments were made which reflected this advice.

Throughout the 1970's the Schools Commission occupied a highly influential role in Australian education. Despite a change of government in 1975 the value of the Commission was such that it continued to operate. By the end of the decade the resource targets which had been set in 1973 had been surpassed in Government schools and Australian schools were greatly changed from what they had been only seven years previously.

<u>The Curriculum Development Centre</u>

In addition to the Schools Commission, the Federal Government also set up the Curriculum Development Centre. This move was consistent with the clear intention of the new minister that the Commonwealth would not only be a funding agency but would be concerned with what happened in classrooms.

The centre had quite broad functions but essentially its purpose was to produce school curricula and associated educational materials which, because of their quality, would be widely acceptable in Australian schools and whose widespread use would bring about both improved teaching/learning and a more common curriculum throughout Australia.

Some work had already been done along these lines through the Australian Council for Educational Research which had managed the Australian Science Education Project. This project, which was a cooperative between States and the Commonwealth, preceded the election of the Labor Government by some three years. It had a good deal of support from States which had been involved in its design and writing. ASEP was significant since as described by Moran (1980 p.54):

> *"ASEP demonstrated that a significant number of teachers and administrators saw Australian science teaching lagging behind most developed countries and were prepared to do something about it. It showed that curriculum developers and educationists had a voice in what happened in schools and that co-operation across State borders was not impossible".*

This realization was reflected in a decision taken in 1974 to institute a second major project, the development of a Social Education Materials Project. This project was assumed by the Curriculum Development Centre when it began operation.

These initiatives were later repeated in the areas of Asian Studies and English Teaching at the lower secondary level.

Trends in Education Policy in the 1980's

While the conduct of schools is a State responsibility, attention in this paper is largely devoted to the role of the Federal Government and its inter-relationship with State systems. There are two reasons for this approach. The first is that in providing an Australian perspective the individual policy decisions of States are irrelevant unless there are initiatives by States which are sufficiently common to constitute an Australia-wide movement or common action results from decisions taken collectively through the Australian Education Council.

The defeat of the Federal Labor Government in 1975, after less than three years in office, diminished the reformist zeal of the Federal Government towards education in schools. The Schools Commission remained in existence and continued to provide advice to the Government on priorities for educational funding. One important issue raised by it was the difficulty of moving towards long term goals through annual budgets and it was suggested that funding should be on the basis of a "rolling-triennium". This would allow schools and school authorities to plan for the future. In accepting the advice the Commonwealth indicated its intention to increase funding in real terms by 2% per annum and to concentrate this funding in the low fee paying non-government schools whose position, vis-a-vis both government schools and high fee non-government schools, had declined despite Schools Commission assistance. The special purpose programmes which had been aimed at increasing equity, were continued.

By 1980 there were grave doubts about Australia's economic position. Rapid inflation, a decline in the price for mineral exports and decline in the competitiveness of Australian manufactured goods led to a severe financial crisis.

As a result the government sought to effect economies. The decision ultimately taken in regard to government schools was not to continue the promised 2% increase in recurrent expenditures but to peg these at the 1979 level. Additionally, as a one year economy measure, the allocation for capital works was reduced by $44 million (32%).

To effect economies in the non-government sector proved an even more difficult problem for the government. In its report (ASC 1979 p.3) the Commission noted:

> *"In the non-government schools (both Catholic and other) increased recurrent resources have been financed from government subsidies with declining, or at best, static, private inputs and services.... More than three quarters of the cash income of Catholic schools now come from government subsidies..."*

Given the reliance of the low fee schools on government aid it was clear that if any economies were to be made they would need to be made in the least dependent schools.

In non-government schools subsidies were paid according to a system of categories. This was a 6 level structure in which the wealthiest schools were classified as level 1 while those least well resourced were level 6. In an attempt to reduce the inequities between schools at the different levels, widely differing subsides were being paid. In 1979, for example, the per capita grant to level 1 schools was 16% of the cost of educating a child in a government school, while in level 6 schools it was more than double this amount. In an effort to contain expenditure the government made no increases in the funding levels for any but the level 6 schools and, as it had done in government schools, reduced capital funding, in the case of non-government schools by 19%.

Some Commonwealth programmes required the cooperation of government and non-government schools. In financial terms the largest of these was provided for the Services and Development Programme. This programme was essentially for the professional development of teachers. At a time when, because of changes which were occurring, professional development was vitally important, funding for this programme was cut by 26%. Since State Governments too were suffering the same financial difficulties as the Commonwealth, these reductions could not be offset through State funding and, in fact, the Commonwealth's lead was followed by some State treasuries.

The School to Work Transition Programme

Faced with youth unemployment of more than 50 000, the Federal Government in 1980 introduced the above programme. The stated objective was to increase the opportunities for under 18 year olds in education, training and employment. The programme, which was to involve both secondary schools and technical colleges, sought to increase retention in secondary schools and to develop either saleable skills or a capacity to benefit from further training. Because the programme spanned technical education (TAFE) and schools, it was not administered through the Schools Commission but by the Commonwealth Department of Education.

In the initial year there was strong objection to the programme by State authorities and schools. This was based on three grounds. The first arose in respect of the Commonwealth's demand that over the five years of the programme the States should progressively assume financial responsibility for the initiatives involved.

The second objection arose from schools which resented the implication that it was because of their failings that high levels of unemployment existed and it was only by changes in the schools that this situation could be overcome.

The third objection was that if the Commonwealth's programme was successful, State Governments would incur increased capital and recurrent funding responsibilities in pursuit of the Commonwealth inspired objective of higher student retention.

After close collaboration between the States to present a united front these objections were resolved and the Commonwealth made a five year funding commitment which included the payment of transition allowances to youths returning to work-experience and training.

This programme was highly significant in a number of ways. The first was that this was the first time that secondary education had been viewed as a direct tool in the fight for economic progress. The second point of significance was the opportunity and encouragement the programme provided for secondary and technical colleges to work together. Such a relationship had not existed in the past. The third point of significance was that since the bulk of the unemployed were students who had not done well in the traditional school, schools were faced with the problem of providing relevant courses for a hitherto largely neglected group.

The experimentation designed to solve this problem was to have a profound effect on secondary school practice generally since changes made to capture the interest of reluctant students, to satisfy their demands for obvious and immediate relevance and the need to involve the community outside the school to do this has subsequently been reflected in the programmes of more able students.

Development of the Transition Programme

This programme, when initiated in 1980, was given a life of 5 years. This was the first time a programme had been guaranteed for such a substantial time. The school aspects were supported by a variety of other schemes conducted on the job, in TAFE colleges or in agencies conducted by community groups.

Given such a combination of contributing agencies it was inevitable that there should be some confusion and overlap and even by March 1981 the Schools Commission noted "The Commission recommends that an assessment of the existing pattern of youth training and support schemes be undertaken with the view of developing a comprehensive youth policy" (Schools Commission 1981 p.102).

As well as breaking new ground in educational terms, the Transition Programme broke new ground administratively. State committees, which included representatives of schools, TAFE, Departments of Employment, Teachers' Union, employers and community, were set up. These committees had the responsibility for recommending projects for funding. Some of these were submitted by community agencies, some by government departments and many by individual schools. Because these schools had access to funding they were able to undertake innovative schemes with the students for whom the courses were designed.

The Transition Programme which was born in disputation between Federal and State authorities, was to have a significant long term effect on the provision of secondary education in Australia and on the nature of the secondary school population.

State influences on education

For those unfamiliar with Australian education, the foregoing would suggest that, while States have Constitutional responsibility for education, most policy changes over the last 15 or 20 years can be attributed to Federal initiatives. There would be a good deal of substance in such a perception. As a '10% shareholder', the Federal Government has had a far greater influence on State education systems than its contribution would suggest. This is so because Commonwealth money can be directed to particular innovative purposes, whereas State funds are used to pay for the basic educational fabric - teachers' salaries, transport of children and the provision of educational services such as curriculum development and research.

Despite the Commonwealth's disproportionate influence, State Governments do influence educational policy making. In recent years these influences have exhibited sufficient commonality for the resultant changes to be described as national directions rather than State specific changes.

It may seem strange that in a country as large as Australia and with such differences in population distribution, the availability of natural resources and resultant occupational differences that there should voluntarily be great similarities between the courses of action followed by different governments. This, however, was true of newly elected Labor Governments in South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia in 1983/1984 and of a non-labour government in Queensland more recently.

Changes in Organizational Structure

Among the changes taking place over much of Australia was organizational restructure.

In all of these States wide-ranging changes in the organization of government departments have taken place. The motivation for these changes has been in resource pressures in which there are ever increasing demands on static or declining government budgets. The necessity to improve the efficiency of the public sector has led to major reorganization and to a demand for 'better managers'.

The nature of the changes in all States listed have been similar. Among the most important are reduced central bureaucracies, devolution of authority to the school level, increased public involvement in school level policy formulation and greater accountability at both school and system level.

In these changes it is of interest to note that the recommendations of the Interim Committee of the Schools Commission, which had met 10 years earlier, concerning devolution and community involvement, were given expression.

Support for Non-Government Schools

As described earlier the question of government aid for non-government schools was a contentious one but by the end of the 1960's was an accepted plank of platform of the major political parties at the Federal level.

In the States too, the political advantage of providing aid to non-government schools was recognized and, as a result, all States began to provide grants to non-government schools. Today these are a firmly established feature of Australian education. All States pay a per-capita grant expressed as a percentage of the cost of educating a child in a government school. All accept that the costs of providing education for pre-school, primary and secondary students are different and pay different amounts to the different levels. In some States all schools at each level receive the same amount for each student. In others, a 'needs' basis is observed with per capita differences between schools of up to 25%.

In addition to per-capita grants, State governments provide a variety of other forms of help. This includes such things as school stocks, interest subsidies on capital works, low interest loans, transport of children and a host of services such as access to curriculum materials, advisory services and so on.

The decision of the Commonwealth and some State governments to fund non-government schools on a needs basis has had a significant effect on the development of non-government education in Australia. As mentioned previously, prior to 1973 there were two quite distinct types of non-government schools - independent schools which were responsible for raising all of their own funds and parish schools staffed largely by members of religious orders. The independent schools, almost all of which were single sex residential colleges, were seen as being largely the preserve of the well-to-do. The parish schools generally charged low fees and while they were subsidized by the church, had low resource levels.

The decision to fund on a needs basis meant that low fee schools would receive substantial assistance from the two levels of government for both recurrent and capital expenditure. Under existing conditions low fee schools can receive up to 75% of the cost of educating a child in a government school and substantial assistance with the cost of erecting buildings and servicing the cost of loans.

As a result of this change, religions other than Catholic, have taken advantage of setting up low fee schools which, in effect, has opened up the option of attendance at a non-government school to most of the community.

In addition to schools which form part of school systems associated with major religious groups, the way has also been opened for groups to establish schools based on different philosophies and Steiner, Montesorri and 'alternative' schools have flourished. In addition small groups of parents have established 'christian' schools based mostly on the use of individualized materials emanating largely from the United States. These schools may be registered and thus become eligible for government assistance so long as their premises are acceptable, they employ trained teachers and provide programmes which include specified subject areas.

Enrolment in the non-government sector has increased from 21.4% of the total enrolment of students in pre-primary, primary and secondary schools in Australia in 1973 to 27% in 1988.

Links with Business

Another initiative which has been pursued across the Australian States as a matter of State policy has been the building of closer links between schools and the business community. These links have taken many forms. They include not only the involvement of business in providing work experience placements, visits to businesses and the provision of guest speakers which has been traditional but involvement in syllabus construction, the development of materials, sponsorship of schools in simulated business games and even 'adoption' of a school by large businesses.

The effects have been beneficial. Schools for their part have become acquainted with the expectations of business while the commercial sector has had the opportunity both to influence the content and quality of what is taught in schools and to gain some appreciation of the constraints under which schools operate.

Performance Measurement

All States have given attention to performance measurement at one or more levels. In some States organizational performance measurement is an audit requirement. Performance indicators based upon corporate plans are subject both to the scrutiny of the Auditor-General and of Parliament.

A second area of performance measurement which has received attention in most States relates to the evaluation of teacher performance. This is particularly the case in terms of selecting for promotion those who are most capable. Promotion-by-merit has strong philosophical support in all areas of the Australian schooling community but the operationalization of the slogan has proved difficult.

Student Certification

A further policy area for which States have total responsibility relates to student certification. As in the area of organizational review, most Australian States are addressing this problem. However, unlike organizational review there is little unanimity in the responses.

The reasons for concern about this matter are common. Throughout Australia retention rates are increasing rapidly with over 50% of the age cohort now remaining to the end of Year 12. To cater for these students whose academic abilities are more varied then ever before, schools are tending to provide a wider range of relevant courses, many of which have at least elements which do not lend themselves to external examinations of the pen and paper type.

At the same time as schools are providing a wider range of courses for a more academically diverse group of students, there is extreme pressure on tertiary institutions for admission. These institutions wish to select the most academically-able of those students who have applied for admission.

To optimize the selection process institutions providing higher education have a strong preference for selection based on performance in a narrow range of subjects of comparable difficulty examined in the most objective way possible. The setting of a common examination done under as nearly identical conditions as possible is seen as meeting this latter condition.

There are clearly contradictions between the wishes of schools to cater for the needs, abilities and interests of their students providing a variety of courses and testing the outcomes in what they perceive to be an appropriate manner and the need to place students from a large number of schools spread over a large geographical area in an equitably derived rank order.

While different States have developed different systems to accommodate these conflicting needs, all now involve at least an element of a school determined mark or grade to supplement the external written examinations. Beyond that similarity there is wide divergence involving the range of subjects, the number of subjects to count for tertiary entry, the period over which courses are studied and examined, the methods by which comparability, both between subjects and schools are achieved, and the basis on which tertiary institutions make their selection decisions.

A change of government

In 1983 the coalition Liberal-Country Party Government was defeated at the polls by a Labor Government. This Government was faced with severe economic problems. The solution of these was to be the main priority for action.

In the Australian Federal Government's budget process budget allocations are normally made for a financial year which extends from July to June. State budgets follow the same pattern. From the time of the setting up of the Schools Commission, however, school funding had covered the January-December period which coincides with the Australian school year. Thus, though the Federal government was elected on May 5, 1983, its first educational budget was not implemented until the beginning of 1984.

Almost immediately upon taking up office, the Minister for Education, Senator Susan Ryan, requested the Schools Commission to define new targets since the Karmel targets had been achieved by most government schools and many of the elite fee-paying schools.

As a result of the Commission's work a publication Funding Policies for Australian Schools (Commonwealth Schools Commission 1984) was produced. This document after consideration of the resources necessary to provide schooling of high quality costed these resources and set this cost as the 'community standard. It was

realized that different circumstances in schools would require a different mix of resources but this flexibility could be achieved within the financial provision of the community standard. Improvements towards these standards were in large measure accepted by the Federal government as the basis for future funding policies.

The education budget for 1984 was brought down within a few months of Labor assuming office. The directions of funding were of great interest to the educational community in view of the importance which the Labor Party had, in its earlier term of office, attached to education.

Given the economic situation it seemed likely that there would not be large increases in allocations and this proved to be the case. There were, however, three significant differences even though the sums involved were relatively small.

The first of these was the announcement of a new programme to be entitled Participation and Equity. The programme was to subsume the previously existing School to Work Transition Programme. However, it was a programme which was much more ambitious in its intentions than simply to increase retention and to assist the assimilation of young people into the economy.

The programme which was described by the Minister as the centre-piece of the government's youth policy stated "The programme will make funds available to the States and non-government schools to stimulate broadly-based changes in secondary education" (Commonwealth Schools Commission 1983 p.1).

It must be reiterated that the Federal government has no constitutional responsibility for education yet its increasing involvement over a period of years through contributing, in quite a small way to government schools, had culminated in a programme which bluntly stated that its objectives were to increase retention, change the organization of secondary schools, reform and diversify the curriculum, review credentialling and assessment, change and develop teacher attitudes and improve the relationship between schools and their communities. All of these objectives were to be achieved by the injection of about $45 million annually into an annual schools education budget of some $7 billion.

In addition to these quite specific classroom-related objectives, the programme also sought to foster "equal educational outcomes". For many years educational rhetoric had revolved around providing equal educational opportunity. The translation to equal outcomes, if it was to be achieved, would clearly require vastly differing inputs to different groups of children. The programme accepted this and made provision for direct assistance to be provided to "schools where students are not gaining the benefits of full participation in education because of the combined effects of cultural and social background and economic factors" (CSC 1983 p.2).

The publicity at the launch of the programme noted "A sustained national effort will be needed for this decade at least...".

The second important initiative included in the 1984 budget for the first time, was funding designed to stimulate the development of computing in secondary schools. At that time there were major differences in the level to which an understanding of computing had been included in the programmes of secondary schools in different States. Here again, the Commonwealth was using specific purpose funding to achieve changes in the curriculum of schools over which they had no constitutional authority.

The third significant difference in the programme announced for 1984 did not involve a new or enhanced programme but a reduction in the level of funding for professional development. It would have been expected that at a time when major changes in both the groups being targeted and the nature of the programme provided at secondary level were being promoted, that such funding would have been increased. The reasons given for this decision was the Commonwealth's stated position that maintenance of the professional skills of teachers was a joint responsibility of the professional and of employers. This decision was significant not only for its allocation of responsibility for future professional development activities but also because it demonstrated that special purpose programmes, such as teacher development, were not necessarily permanent features of the schools' financial landscape.

Other Commonwealth Funded Programmes

As well as general recurrent grants, capital grants and long running programmes such as those designed to assist disadvantaged schools, the Commonwealth through the Schools Commission, funded many small innovative programmes and programmes dealing with special projects. One major avenue for funds was through Special Projects of National Significance. A wide range of topics which provided both information for other systems and exemplary programmes were funded in this way. The list of such projects for 1984 included 33 separate projects, ranging from a $2464 grant to consider "Diabetic Children in the School Environment" through the development of a Transition Curriculum Programme for Refugee Students ($46 640) to a national Review of Teacher Education ($77 476).

As well as Projects of National Significance, there was also funding, usually in programmes lasting for only 2-4 years, to investigate, develop and initiate programmes which supported the directions in which the Schools Commission believed education should be progressing. Among the items funded in 1984 were programmes designed to develop choice and diversity in government schools, to develop policies which would improve the outcomes of schooling for girls, to improve provision for gifted and talented children, to improve techniques of school evaluation, to encourage means of promoting closer and more effective relationships between school and community, to improve the education of Aboriginal children, to develop education in the arts, and so on.

The breadth of programmes which were being sponsored by the Schools Commission, meant that its influence was pervasive throughout schooling in Australia even though the sums it was providing were relatively small.

One other significant change implemented in 1984 was to amend the Commonwealth Schools Commission Act to include, within the role of the Schools Commission, responsibility for the Curriculum Development Centre which had previously been independently responsible to the Federal Minister.

The Period 1985-1987

While the Federal government's 1984 programme had been of interest as an indicator of what changes it might make, it was a programme which had to be put together in haste since the budget was due within three months of assuming office and which had to continue what had been funded previously. It was to be expected that any major long-term changes in policy would be reflected in 1985. Simple comparisons of the budget provisions for 1984 and 1985 would not have reflected the quite major changes which were taking place since the amounts provided did not vary greatly and the only new programme introduced was a sum of some $5 million designed to focus attention on basic learning in primary schools.

There were, however, massive changes in programme management. The first of these was the transfer of the administrative management of the General Recurrent and Capital Grants Programmes, previously administered by the relatively independent Schools Commission, to the Commonwealth Department of Education.

Additionally, following on a major report "Quality of Education in Australia" (Quality of Education Review Committee 1985) was a change in the way in which recurrent grants would be made to States.

The Quality of Education Review Committee had been set up by the Federal Minister for Education. Its aim was "develop strategies for the Commonwealth government in its involvement in primary and secondary education for raising the standards attained by students in communication, literacy and numeracy and for improving the relationship between secondary schooling and subsequent employment and education".

The committee made a number of significant recommendations among which was that there should be concentration on the outcomes of education rather than inputs. The committee proposed that there were general competencies which were required by all individuals and that Commonwealth funding should be concentrated on assuring the acquisition of these. The five competencies considered essential were: acquiring information, conveying information, applying logical processes, undertaking tasks as an individual and undertaking tasks as a member of a group.

It was conceded by the committee that the attainment of these competencies depended upon teachers and that there should therefore be an emphasis on improving teacher quality through inservice development. Expenditure on this function was thus seen as a legitimate use of Commonwealth funding.

The committee also took the view that in the past too many objectives had been sought simultaneously through Commission programmes, that short-term funding had prevented long-term planning and that the existing financial arrangements between Commonwealth and States were too rigid.

The recommendation made by the committee was that the Commonwealth should use four delivery mechanisms for its funding:

- negotiated agreements under which general funding would be provided by the Commonwealth for the achievement of specified objectives;
- long-term specific purpose programmes;
- limited life specific programmes, and
- directly administered initiatives mounted by the Commonwealth.

Acting on this advice the Commonwealth announced an eight year programme of recurrent funding which would be the subject of negotiated resource agreements with States and would involve the States in providing outcome measures.

On the one hand States violently objected to the Commonwealth's demands for accountability in outcome terms. On the other hand the proposals gave stability to educational funding which would allow long-term planning and were designed over the eight year period to increase the per capita grant for each primary student by over 30% per annum and for each secondary student by 74%. With such significant sums involved, all but one State agreed to these proposals.

Some changes in the capital grants for government schools were announced. These mainly related to shifting the balance between the provision of new places which was seen as largely a State government responsibility and refurbishment and upgrading of older schools.

The non-government sector was also faced with major changes in 1985. The first of these was a change in the categorization of schools according to their level of resources. Initially, there were three categories of non-government schools receiving respectively 20%, 30% and 38% of the cost of educating a child in a government school. Later this was increased to 6 categories. In 1985 this scheme was modified to reflect 12 categories of school. The level 1 schools had their allocations frozen. Level 12 schools, on the other hand, received increases of the order of 40% over the maximums which had previously existed. This reflected the Commonwealth's concern that the relative position of the least wealthy schools was continuing to decline.

Non-government schools, like government schools, were also to receive guarantees of funding for the period 1985-1994. At the lower levels of funding (levels 1 and 2) no increases in real terms would be provided. At the other end of the scale, however, increases of up to 32% would be paid to the least wealthy primary schools and 24% to secondary schools.

Several conditions were attached to these grants. The first was that schools should maintain, in real terms, their level of per student recurrent expenditure from private sources and that to maintain their present categories, a 3% increase in income, raised by schools, would be required.

Changes were made too in the capital grants. Joint State-Commonwealth committees were set up to ensure that there would be no excess accommodation capacity. If a new non-government school was proposed it needed to be shown that it was justified and that existing schools, government or non-government, would not be adversely affected by the building of the new school. In addition, new schools must be of an economic size. This was done to provide some control over the rapidly increasing number of non-government schools.

In addition to the above changes which flowed largely from the Quality of Education Review Committee's report, another report was published in 1985. This report, Quality and Equality (Commonwealth Schools Commission 1985), focused on specific purpose programmes.

The terms of reference required this committee to report on the effectiveness of existing programmes, the relative roles of Commonwealth, State and community groups and advice on accountability arrangements. The linking of these programmes to the search for equality of educational outcomes was a clear recognition of the aims which the Schools Commission had for this group of programmes.

The recommendations recommended the continued provision of equity-related programmes and identified socio-economic, cultural and gender-related factors contributing to inequality as well as the effects of isolation and physical and intellectual disabilities.

In some quarters this report was seen as an attempted rebuttal by the Schools Commission of the QERC Report. It precipitated relatively little discussion.

The laying out of future directions by the Commonwealth during 1985 greatly reduced the uncertainties which had previously existed, particularly with respect to the two major elements of Commonwealth funding, i.e. general recurrent funding and capital. However, there were major changes in 1986 and 1987, some of which caused grave concern at the State level.

The first of these was an announcement at the commencement of 1986 that the Participation and Equity Programme, which only two years before had been hailed as the centre-piece of the Government's youth policy, had its funding halved and its termination in 1987 announced.

In equally spectacular fashion, funding for the English as a Second Language Programme was cut from $60.8m to $35.12m despite continuing immigration of non-English speaking migrants.

In addition, the Commonwealth ceased providing funds specifically for the professional development of teachers.

The decisions regarding these programmes caused grave concern. All were important to all States and their termination or reduction were viewed with alarm.

Clearly, the decision to massively reduce the language funding would have a profound effect on non-English speaking migrants. Politically, States had no alternative but to continue these programmes and much of the general recurrent grant increases were used to replace the language and teacher education programmes.

These decisions, made unilaterally by the Commonwealth, may have been economically essential but they left a legacy of suspicion in States about Commonwealth initiatives which allow the Commonwealth to achieve its short-term objectives but leave States with financial responsibility for programmes which are worthy of funding but are not the State's own priorities.

It was ironical that at a time when there was such suspicion and, indeed, antagonism between States and Commonwealth, that the first nationally accepted policy statement was published. This statement, The National Policy for the Education of Girls in Australian Schools, was published in May 1987. It was the culmination of years of effort by Senator Ryan and the Schools Commission.

It was also to be one of the last actions of that body whose influence had been considerably reduced by the transfer of all but its policy advisory function to the Commonwealth Department of Education.

In the 14 years of its life great changes had taken place in Australian education. Many of these had resulted from the influence of the Schools Commission. A review of progress indicates that of the six 'values' expressed in its 1973 document, 1987 saw less central control over schools and far greater devolution of authority and responsibility to them than had existed.

The Commission had pursued the equity goal with great determination. Its quest for greater equality of opportunity for girls appears to have had a significant effect not only in terms of changing their expectations of schooling but in sensitizing young people to the question of disadvantage generally. It may even be that a self-sustaining movement has been created. In other equity areas the success has been more limited. Despite programmes for economically and socially disadvantaged children, success measured by their retention into educational courses which give entry to the professions is still low as it is for children who live in the country. Education has contributed to a society which accepts and values multiculturalism more than the society of 1973 but substantial work remains to be done. It is in the area of Aboriginal education that least progress has been made despite continued and continuing efforts at State and Federal levels.

The Commission's support for diversity has been realized. The variety of courses available to students, particularly at the secondary level, has multiplied and devolution, together with the abolition of school boundaries, has allowed schools to take on quite distinctive personalities.

Perhaps the most successful area of the Commission's work had been in the expansion of the non-government sector. Strong financial support from both Federal and State governments have seen both political and financial advantage in the support of non-government schools. It has led to the emergence of many low-fee schools and has made a 'private' school education affordable by parents available to a greatly increased percentage of children.

A fifth 'value' espoused by the Schools Commission in its 1973 statement had been promotion of community involvement in schooling. At that time there was little such involvement in most States. Today, parents or their representatives have a legislatively binding right to be involved in decision-making at the school level.

The final 'value' of the Commission had been directed towards affirming that the role of schools was concerned with the acquisition of skills and knowledge. In all States by 1987 the provision of relevant and appropriate education for a far larger percentage of students than could have been envisaged in 1973 had become a reality.

As early as 1978 the Commission was seen by Keeves and Mathews to have contributed to:

> *"...general rejuvenation and improvement in the quality of the education debate; the vastly improved morale, enthusiasm and involvement of those concerned in the schooling process; the increased willingness to grapple with basic philosophical questions about the functions of schooling; and the more positive climate for education".*

By 1987 the Commission had made a major contribution to Australian education but new agendas were about to dominate the Australian educational debate.

Towards the 1990's

In June 1987 the Federal Labor Government was re-elected for a third three year term. The ensuing period has been one during which major changes have been proposed which were not envisaged in drafting the Federal Constitution. To understand these changes it is necessary to look beyond the narrow educational scene.

In forming the Ministry in June 1987, the Prime Minister (Bob Hawke) took a completely new approach. This involved the setting up of a small number of 'super ministries' in place of the 27 which had previously existed.

The 'super-ministry', which included education, was the Department of Employment, Education and Training. Instead of being headed by a relatively junior senator, the new ministry was headed by John Dawkins, a senior member of the House of Representatives. The grouping of employment with education and training reflected a belief that Australia's future prosperity was associated with the development of a highly educated and skilled work-force. The view that education, and many other activities of government should contribute to Australia's increased competitiveness, has been termed "economic rationalism".

From the outset Dawkins made it clear that he proposed to bring about major changes in education generally in Australia and that he would use the Federal Government's funding power to enforce these changes.

Changes in the School Sector

During the fifteen years of its existence the Schools Commission had used a highly consultative approach and much of the dialogue between State systems and the Commonwealth took place under the Commission's general sponsorship.

Another forum for discussion across the whole education spectrum was the Australian Education Council. This Council was set up in 1936 to "provide a basis of continuous consultation among Australian Governments on aspects of education, particularly in relation to the responsibility of the States and Commonwealth" (Spaull 1987 p.14). The new body was to consist of both Commonwealth and State Ministers. It was to have a "Standing Committee on Education" comprised of the permanent heads of State Departments of Education, Superintendents of Technical Education and Commonwealth representatives.

The Australian Education Council has been a steady contributor to dialogue between the State systems and between these systems and the Commonwealth. It has been involved in managing working parties which have led to cooperative decisions by States. It has set up a business enterprise (ASCIS) which produces school library catalogue information,developed the Australian Curriculum Information Network, the Australian Co-operative Assessment Programme, has contributed to national policy statements in areas such as equal opportunity and the education of girls and has produced agreements between States e.g. in respect of a common convention for spelling and punctuation.

In recent years the ambit of the Australian Education Council has increased significantly. It has established links with the Education Commission of the States (U.S.) and is involved in the OECD initiatives in regard to performance indicators.

It was to this increasingly important body that the Federal Minister for Education brought a number of proposals concerning schooling in Australia in 1988.

Proposals for Schooling, 1988 and Beyond

Changes to the recurrent funding of schooling involving resource agreements between States had commenced in 1985 and guarantees concerning funding had been given for four years. These guarantees expired at the end of 1988.

At the June 1988 meeting of the Australian Education Council in Darwin, the Federal Minister tabled a paper entitled "Strengthening Australia's Schools : A Consideration of the Focus and Content of Schooling" (Dawkins 1988). The paper noted "...schools play a critical and central role in the nature of our society and economy. ...There is little to be gained from adjustment to the structure of our nation and the way we live and work if the central position of the school is ignored. That would be self-defeating". The view was clear, the nation's future depended upon the nation's schools. The Federal Minister was calling for a national effort to strengthen the nation by strengthening Australia's schools.

In the document the Federal Minister stated "The Australian States have had and will continue to have primary responsibility for the education of our young people." He further noted "the Commonwealth recognizes.... it is not the primary policy maker in schools. But the Commonwealth will not ignore the very real responsibility it has to provide national leadership."

In calling for a national effort for schools the Minister noted "Accordingly we have decided to invite the cooperation of the States to develop and implement a national effort to strengthen the capacity of our schools to meet the challenges they face".

The actions which were proposed to this end were: (1) development of a clear statement of the fundamental purposes of schools (2) preparation of a common curriculum framework for use throughout the nation but within which the needs of different parts of Australia could be accommodated (3) criteria for methods of assessing the achievement of curriculum objectives would co-operatively be developed (4) a common national approach to assessment and reporting to parents and the community would be negotiated (5) improvement in the quality of training of teachers and perhaps their registration would be pursued (6) an increase in the retention of students to year 12 to 65% by the early 1990's would be sought (7) the targeting of presently under represented groups in the quest for greater equity of opportunity would be continued and expanded.

The States' Responses

It was to be expected that in a Federal/State relationship any proposal which has the effect of changing the powers of one partner at the expense of the others, would be met with opposition, if not hostility. This was the initial reaction, particularly from the newly elected Liberal government of New South Wales.

Despite its lack of constitutional powers, the Federal Government had some incentives at its disposal which could be used. Among these were (1) three of the States were governed by Labor from whom the Federal Government could expect some support (2) 1988 was the Bicentenary of Australia and a strong nationalistic spirit was evident in the country (3) there was a strong lobby group among people who were mobile between States. Most important among these were armed services families but there is a high level of interstate migration with consequent pressure for uniformity of educational provision (4) probably much more importantly, the resource agreements for the next four years needed to be endorsed and these were highly significant to the States (5) the previous resource agreements were administratively awkward, requiring separate negotiation of priorities, outcome indicators and financial arrangements. Much simpler arrangements were offered if there was acceptance of the Commonwealth's proposals.

As a result of these offers the expected outright rejection of the proposal did not eventuate. This was perhaps because States had observed Dawkins handling of equally radical changes in tertiary education which had been implemented in spite of strong opposition and recognized his determination. Whatever the reasons it was agreed that the feasibility of the proposal would be investigated and discussed at a special meeting in October.

To determine the feasibility of these proposals a number of working parties were set up. One of these produced a series of options concerning the conditions under which Federal financial grants would be made available. These ranged from untied grants to a system based on agreed national priorities, national testing and publication of State and system results. The latter was the Commonwealth's preferred position.

A second group consisting of the Directors of Curriculum undertook an overview of the curriculum across the States. This overview confirmed that there was a good deal of commonality of content and a much greater similarity in the broad general objectives of education in the States. A national curriculum was thus a possibility.

A third group met to review a Commonwealth-produced paper on Goals of Schooling. A statement in terms sufficiently general to allow for States to pursue specific objectives while providing a basis for national reporting was produced.

A further existing working party provided options in terms of ways in which evaluation could be undertaken at the national level.

The final working party was asked to consider how existing organizations which provided educational services to schools might be more effectively organized. States, and the Commonwealth, were already jointly engaged in groups concerned with educational research, curriculum construction, library and information services but in addition had similar functions being performed within States. Adoption of a more co-operative approach was seen to have potential in reducing overall outlays on education.

At the special October meeting of the Australian Education Council reports from all groups were tabled. The reports could be classified into three categories - those on which further work was required (curriculum review and agency cooperation) those on which there was substantial agreement (goals of schooling) and those where there was strong disagreement from one or more States (funding options and national reporting).

In view of these findings the Commonwealth agreed to interim arrangements covering the 1989 school year based on bilateral discussion. The Commonwealth's overall determination that continued Commonwealth participation in the funding of government schools would be on the basis of agreed national objectives, outcome oriented performance indicators and national reporting, was made clear.

Further discussions concerning these matters will take place at another AEC meeting to be held in April 1989.

Consideration of these Trends in the Context of Changing Social Goals:Federal/State Relations

In the necessarily short account of developments in Australian education in recent years a number of different periods can be identified. These were related to the social climate of the times. The setting up of the Schools Commission in 1973 reflected the belief of a government (with Labor being returned to office after 24 years) that society could be changed through changing the education system and by ensuring equal opportunity for all students. To this end substantial funding of education at the Federal level was willingly made available. Schools and the conditions of those who studied and worked in them were improved but the attempt to bring about major changes in society through this avenue were disappointing.

The late 1970's with the onset of double digit unemployment and double digit inflation brought about a realization that Australia was no longer 'the lucky country' and that economic survival depended upon major changes being made. The rhetoric of the conservative government was that it was not the economy which was in need of overhaul but that schools had failed to provide a workforce with the necessary skills. This view was promoted by the media and the blame was attached mostly to government schools. This was reflected in reduced expenditure and an emphasis on vocational training.

Since 1983 a Labor government has held office. When it assumed government, Australia's financial situation was critical and, as a result, the government placed major emphasis on improving this position.

Economic Concerns in the 1980's

There are particular problems for governments faced with severe economic problems if their power-base rests principally on the less well off. The 'softest' areas of government expenditure are concerned with the provision of what might be described as social services and yet Labor's supporters tend to be the main beneficiaries of such services.

This dilemma faced by governments has been expressed by Costello and Dawkins (1983 p.68) in the following terms:

> *"The need to take control of our economic life in the 1980's intersects with another great need of the 1980's. This is to give effect to Labor's vision of Australia as a just and equal society. These two great tasks are so intimately connected that progress in one is impossible without progress in the other".*

Faced with this dilemma an approach was embarked upon by the Federal Government which had three main features. The first was to attempt to reduce public expenditure partly by improving the efficiency of the public sector but largely through applying a 'user pays' principle to many services. The second strategy was to conduct negotiations with the trade union movement to enter into an "accord". This accord was based upon community acceptance that Australia was living beyond its means. In Australia most wages and salaries in both the private and public sector are fixed by State and Federal arbitration courts. Under the "accord" unions accepted that real wages had to be reduced and this has been done in an orderly way through the courts. Finally, but most importantly in the longer term, attention has been focused on improving Australia's competitive position. Financial inducements have been offered to industry to invest in the most modern plant and equipment. Efforts have been made through education to improve the skills and knowledge of the workforce. At the tertiary level this has involved application of the user pays principle. In the government's view, however, a critical element is what is termed "industry re-structuring". This process consists of removing all work practices which inhibit effective operation and re-shaping the manner in which occupations operate. As part of the wage-fixing process any union seeking any increase in the remuneration of its members is required to enter into an agreement to investigate industry re-structuring.

The Dawkins' Proposals for Schooling in Australia

As has been described earlier, the present Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training has proposed major changes to "Strengthen Australia's Schools". In attempting to forecast whether these changes are likely to be implemented, three questions need to be answered. The first such question is "Is a change which will be bitterly opposed and extremely difficult to bring about sufficiently important to the Federal Government to make it worthwhile? Given the determination of this government in its efforts to increase competitiveness and given the centrality the government places on the development of human resources, the answer to this question is probably yes!

The second question which requires resolution is "Can the Federal Government influence state governments to voluntarily adopt the changes which it proposes or require the changes through the constitution?" Throughout this document it has been emphasized that the Federal Government's direct contribution to State education systems is only of the order of 10%. However, the importance of this 10% has also been emphasized. The position of the Federal Government as the principal tax collector, however, gives it additional influence. Unlike United States and Canadian state and provincial governments, state governments in Australia do not levy direct income tax though they have the power to do so. They

are thus absolved from the political responsibility for levying such taxes. The power of the Federal Government to vary 'grants' to the states and to make special grants through the Grants Commission, however, gives the Federal Government very significant financial power if it chooses to exercise this. It is doubtful, however, that states would agree to the continuance of the present taxation system if the Federal Government applied increased financial pressure in attempting to increase federal powers. As an alternative to financial pressure the constitution may offer a way through which states might be influenced. At present the constitution gives the Federal Government no direct control of education. It is highly unlikely, given the reluctance which Australians have shown to amend the constitution for the transfer of this power to the Federal Government through referendum. An interesting prospect, however, has been opened up by recent High Court decisions. A prominent Australian educator has pointed out that the external affairs responsibility of the Commonwealth gives it constitutional power to implement treaties to which it is a signatory Commenting on a case in which this power was used, (Birch 1983 p.234) states:

> *"The arguments of the justices and the implications of the decision for the governance of schooling in the Australian Federal system - given the several international conventions which have education as a central concern or allude to it and to which Australia is a signatory - are explored in this paper. The broad interpretation by the Court both gives the Commonwealth powers over education not hitherto held and negates the commonly held view that education is a State's right".*

In view of this there may be constitutional power but any attempt to make use of such a power would be bitterly opposed.

The final question which requires an answer is "Is it practically feasible for the Federal Government to bring about the changes which it has proposed?"

In answering this question it must be remembered that the Federal Government does not seek operational control over the nation's schools and at no time has proposed this. What it has sought to do is to accept the constitutional devolution of control to States but to influence what happens within the schools. It is of interest to note that this has been the process used by States in their devolution of authority to their own schools. The linchpin of this influence is the Federal Government's insistence on national reporting. Any educator who has been involved in syllabus development will know that whatever the philosophic intention of the syllabus this will only be realized if the examination reflects this philosophy. It is the nature of the report card which influences teaching/learning within schools. The Commonwealth in "selling" national reporting has described the sorts of performance measures which might form the basis of the report to the nation. In doing this, attention has been focused on relatively non-contentious indicators of various types. There has been no reference to a national scorecard or a "league table" of systems or schools. However, if national testing was to be part of the framework, there is little doubt that considerable influence could be exerted on what happens in Australia's schools.

Other Factors Influencing Educational Policy Making in the 1980's

In addition to changes arising from Federal-State relations other changes in education policy have been necessitated in response to a changing social climate.

Pressure Groups

Attempts to influence what happens in government schools in Australia comes from many quarters. Perhaps the most important of these are parents, teachers' unions and social welfare agencies both public and private.

In the past parents had relatively little influence in government schools. Teachers were regarded as 'experts' and apart from some fund raising, parents accepted what happened in schools. Increasing levels of citizen education, changes in the perception of human service organizations by tax-payers, the increasing importance of qualifications in securing a desirable occupation and legislative changes which have given parents formal involvement in decision-making at the local school level have radically altered parental involvement in schools. It may be too early to accurately interpret what the effect of these changes will be. Initial observation, however, indicates that it has led to greater acceptance by parents of what schools are doing, increased support for the work of schools and the realization by governments that education is an increasingly important political issue.

The influence of teachers' unions on education in Australia is highly significant. In the past, teaching was regarded as a profession and teachers were both independent within their classrooms and their work loads were a matter of individual negotiation at the school level. More recently, individual state teachers' unions have become members of state councils of trade unions. These bodies include all trades. The result of this contact has been insistence by unions on specification of the roles and responsibilities of teachers, hours of class contact, size of classes and so on. In addition, an Australia-wide federation of teachers' unions has been set up and the intention to seek a federal salary and conditions award has been announced. Such a body will represent all teachers in the negotiation of industry restructuring described earlier.

The third major pressure group attempting to influence education involves those who see schools as a vehicle for the particular causes they represent. The expectation that schools should accept an increasing social role is widely held and there is increasing pressure for schools to take over roles previously occupied by parents, the extended family, churches and youth clubs. In many ways these forces are mutually cancelling but an amalgamation of any two of these groups would be powerful in achieving policy changes.

Accountability

As has happened in other countries the concept of accountability has flourished in Australia in recent years. Nowhere has this been more strongly evident than in the public sector where the need to provide more services with static or declining budgets has brought from governments a quest for efficiency and effectiveness which rivals the most entrepreneurial organizations in the private sector.

At the whole of government level chief executives have been given wider powers to manage than ever before. However, this increased authority has been matched by increased accountability. This takes a variety of forms. Government enterprises in most states are required to prepare corporate plans which specify their intentions. Performance indicators must be provided and the Auditor-General in his annual report to Parliament is required to comment on the suitability of the indicators and the extent to which they have been achieved. In addition, in some states, performance agreements which specify that chief executive officers will achieve agreed objectives or be personally responsible are commonly used.

In the specific area of schooling, in addition to these state mandated accountability measures, the Federal Government through negotiated resource agreements requires outcome oriented performance indicators to be specified and met.

In an attempt to ensure discharge of their responsibilities, senior bureaucrats have initiated procedures which impose accountability for both efficiency and effectiveness on schools. There are many who would claim that the devolution

process is a way of forcing financial accountability at the school level. At this level too, there is pressure for the introduction of regular teaching performance review; a procedure which has not been used in Australian schools for twenty years. It is of interest to note that in the climate which accepts re-structuring as an economic necessity, teachers' unions are showing little opposition to a practice which in the past would have been bitterly resisted.

In a number of states, governments have indicated their intention to introduce mandatory system-wide testing of whole cohorts of students. Teachers' unions in Australia have always totally rejected plans to do this believing that to do so exerts a major narrowing influence on the curriculum. They also claim that such testing encourages comparisons between schools which are totally different in their intakes.

It is too early to be sure of the stand which will be taken by the Australian Teachers' Federation but history suggests that any decision to proceed along these lines will be met with fierce resistance.

Non-government Schools

In an earlier section of this paper, the growth of government aid to non-government schools was traced. The growth of such aid has been paralleled by growth in enrolments in non-government schools. Since the number of children in Australia is declining overall and non-government schools are increasing, a significant reduction in the number of children attending government schools is occurring and in some states this decline is quite dramatic.

Many reasons are postulated for the growth of the non-government sector. Common among these are that such schools have a clearly espoused spiritual/moral position, that because students have no right to entry disciplinary standards can be set at a higher level, that there are future socio-economic benefits from membership of a prestigious school and so on.

For their part, supporters of government schools claim that non-government schools are divisive and that they do not allow their students to gain a realistic appreciation of the diversity of Australian society. More commonly the criticism is made that government support for non-government schools together with tax concessions for parental contributions to such schools allows non-government schools to be better resourced than their government counterparts. Supporters point out that government schools are locked into a vicious circle in which increasing ease of access to non-government schools is leading to the flight from government schools of the children of the most influential and able parents. Such a trend, taken to an extreme, would see government schools as residual schools catering only for those disadvantaged by socio-economic status, disability, isolation and/or transiency. The need to revitalize government schools has been part of the reason for the devolution to schools of authority and responsibility.

The finding of a balance between government and non-government education is one of the problems confronting education authorities throughout Australia.

Teacher Morale and Supply

Among the most generally accepted beliefs of education is that the quality of education is closely related to the quality and enthusiasm of the teaching force. In Australia over the past 10 years a number of factors have coincided which have affected the supply of teachers of high quality, particularly those required to teach science, mathematics, business and languages in secondary schools.

The need to reduce government expenditure in the light of Australia's economic crisis in the late 1970's and through the 1980's has been documented. Because of this there was little improvement in pupil:teacher ratios and a consequent reduction in the previously buoyant demand for teachers. As an economy measure, too, bursaries which had previously been paid to trainee teachers were discontinued. Bursaries in the past had encouraged able but less financially well-off students to achieve a tertiary education by entering teaching.

With reduced demand for teachers, colleges of advanced education changed their profiles and converted to courses such as business and computing.

The "accord" mentioned previously led to reduced living standards generally but the burden fell unequally upon those in the public sector who had professional or sub-professional qualifications. This occurred because some wage and salary increases were by fixed amounts not by percentage increase as had been the case in the past. Teachers and academics were amongst those most affected by this 'plateau indexation' during this period and the financial attraction of teaching declined. In these circumstances students who had the ability to undertake science and mathematics courses did not choose to do the extra education required to become a teacher and shortages of teachers began to emerge in these areas.

With the improvement in the economy during the mid 1980's, attractive positions in private industry became available and some existing teachers, particularly of science and mathematics and those with accountancy qualifications, accepted these positions.

As mentioned earlier during the early 1980's there was strong media criticism of teachers generally and some consequent reduction in the perception of both the importance of teaching and the desirability of being a teacher. As a result morale was affected.

In the present Federal Government's economic strategy, education has a major part to play but if this is to be successful there is a need to restore both the financial attractiveness of teaching and the prestige which once was attached to the profession. Perhaps the industry re-structuring proposals will provide the opportunity for this to happen.

Federal-State Relationships - A Post Script

Federal-State relationships take different forms in different countries. As has been pointed out the Australian Constitution set out to preserve most power for states but increasingly the Federal Government is assuming greater importance at this time.

Elazar (p.360) has noted:

> *"In any federal system it is likely that there will be continued tension between the federal government and the constituent polities over the years and the different "balances" between them will develop at different times. The existence of this tension is an integral of the federal relationship and its character does much to determine the future of federalism in each system".*

It is clearly evident that Federal/State relations in education in Australia are in a state of flux. It is to the credit of the Federal Minister of Education that he has recognized the importance of education as part of a national economic strategy and has moved with boldness to propose many new initiatives both in schooling and in education more generally even though these proposals lie outside what has been perceived previously as the Federal Government's area of responsibility.

While there are tensions between State and Federal authorities in education there has never been any suggestion that the Federal system will not continue to operate. It is therefore surprising that in one of his last speeches as Governor- General, Sir Ninian Stephen, has raised this possibility in the following terms:

> *"..There are, I think, some fundamental beliefs involved in this business of being an Australian...*
>
> *...Central to those beliefs seems to me to be unity of identity, that we are one nation, superficially regional in a state-loyalty sense but wholly without separatist tendencies. This regionalism is pervasive,...*
>
> *But this regionalism is really a perverse manifestation of our unity, of the total absence of any inclination towards secession from the Federal union...*
>
> *Then, closely linked to this unity of identity, is a unity of belief in the form of government we want: unhesitatingly a democratic one, however much we complain about too frequent elections and too many politicians. Incidentally, I don't sense the same national certainty about federalism as I do about unity and democracy; despite our regional loyalties, one could conceive of a single, central government, combined with a local government system having greater powers than at present, as something acceptable to many, though of course not all Australians..."*

Lessons from the Australian/American/Canadian Experience: Future Prospects

Lessons from the Australian Experience

The predominating characteristic affecting all areas of education throughout the time period being considered, is that of change. There has been considerable ferment in respect to Australia's schools, a mesh of impulses, and demands for reform, as described above, from which there have been a variety of responses. The pressures for reform are related to many factors - some external, such as the 'effects of social cultural and political changes, economic adjustments and industry developments... in other parts of the world which have led to pressures for the education system to respond' (Dawkins 1987). Some internal pressures are, for example, granting more powers to schools, resisting the clamour for curriculum to become more vocationally oriented and implementing principles of social justice in the operation of school systems. However, while there have been many policy changes in the administration of Australian schools during the period under review, one commentator suggests that the schools have '... escaped relatively unscathed from the 10 year long upheaval that disrupted the education bureaucracy. They have been, by and large, the static core in the cyclone of structural change' (Maslen G 1988).

The changes have included the structural reorganization of most State departments of education and the demise of the Schools Commission (with its functions essentially being absorbed into an expanded federal department now called the Department of Employment, Education and Training). The latter development is of concern to many educators who saw the Schools Commission as being responsive to the real needs of school communities by being well informed and connected and providing professional leadership.

One could catalogue many controversial features of school-related education policy developments over recent years which include the lack of planning for future directions, the continuing challenge for more decentralization in the running of schools, the capitulation to the so-called economic imperative with its instrumental philosophical base dominating the thinking of senior policy makers, the significant decrease in support for teachers' professional development and the continuing lack of a broad curriculum perspective focusing on Australia's place in the broader world community (evident, for example, in the relative neglect in the teaching of languages other than English).

Among the positive gains over the decade has been the fact that education has assumed a higher profile; there is improved access for disadvantaged groups, with marked gains in implementing equal opportunity policies for women and girls, and there has been a recent upsurge of interest in developing a national approach to the goals of schooling, to curriculum issues and assessment.

One lesson for school reform is that even when schools are targeted for change, there are forces of resistance aimed at maintaining the status quo. In an American study of the implementation of Individually Guided Education, it was noted that '... Schools did not merely adapt the programme, making modifications to reach the same goal; rather, they revised both the technology and its espoused goals...'(Pophewitz T S et al 1982). These findings raise substantive questions about the way in which reform is conceptualized and planned. Similar findings emerged from a recent Australian study of a federal programme, entitled Participation and Equity Programme (PEP), which aimed to help more young people complete a full secondary education and more generally to insure more equitable outcomes of education. A study conducted by a team led by Kemmis concluded that:

> *'Participants in the Program found themselves at the forward edge of a highly visible program in which the government, its senior advisers and education officials, had placed great hopes. The Commonwealth Minister for Education had referred to it as the centre piece of the Government's Youth Policy. Those working in the program were caught in a tension familiar to many intervention program: the point at which confusion could easily arise about whether their successes and failures could be attributed to design effects or performance effects'.*

Future Prospects

In looking to the future Australians will need to take heed of basic socio-cultural challenges currently confronting our nation if we are to broaden our vision as a relatively young nation. A leading Australian commentator, Donald Horne (1988), has indicated three such challenges with important educational implications, namely:

- the need for Australians collectively to assert our own culture;
- the need for Australians to recognize and strongly support creativity; and,
- the need for a greater acceptance of the 'creative potential' of the challenges of change.

People, until recently, have spoken to the 'cultural cringe' by which is meant the phenomenon of Australians feeling our society is rather hopeless culturally and without many highly talented people linked to a brain drain to overseas countries. A recent push for Australian studies in our educational institutions will, hopefully, help to foster a sense of national pride and assist in meeting the challenges posed by Horne.

In respect to Federal/State relations, one can propose three scenarios - an expansive federal role, a contracting federal role, and thirdly, maintaining the status quo into the future. It is not possible to gauge which one will eventuate (in fact, two or all three could prevail at various stages). Some tentative propositions, however, can be advanced:

Proposition 1

The best approximation that can be made of future patterns of Federal/State relations is to anticipate the consequences of the influence of several lead indicators, namely:

- decisions of the High Court which result in constitutional interpretations affecting education;
- the political complexion of Federal and State Governments and their respective educational platforms;
- the future role and decisions of consultative bodies which are specifically set up to facilitate Federal/State cooperation; and
- the objectives and effectiveness of main pressure groups, particularly teachers' unions and parent councils.

It seems likely, however, that at least in the short term there will be a movement towards greater similarities of schooling provision between States than is presently the case.

Proposition 2

In the short term, the decision-making capacity of the Federal Government in respect to some educational matters will be cooperatively decided by the States and the Federal Government. We anticipate a trend to New Centralism which means greater devolution of management responsibility to schools accompanied by strengthened centralizing of policy generation, goal setting and performance monitoring. There will be continuing tension between Federal and State authorities in formulating education policies with the former being interested in central planning with the nation's economic well-being the central concern and the latter emphasizing devolution and grass roots considerations.

Proposition 3

Pressure groups and individuals will become more prominent at all levels of policy determination; for example, at the federal level they will challenge Federal programmes and policies and at the local level they will attempt to be increasingly involved in the planning of curricula and in the operation of schools.

In his authoritative book on public policy analysis, Dunn (1981) indicates that the functions of public policy evaluation can be seen in terms of the following cycles - adjustment cycles, continuation cycles, termination cycles and restructuring cycles. He also reminds us that the real essence of policy evaluation is to ask the key question of policies - what difference do they make? It is clear, in the final analysis, that the changes in education policy in Australia over the past decade have been related to all four cycles. It is an intellectually curious adventure to speculate on whether this pattern will pertain throughout the nineties.

Many still hold the vision advocated in earlier decades by J H Newman who described an adequate education as follows 'It aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the public taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspiration, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power and refining the intercourse of private life. It is education which gives man a clear conscious view of his opinions and judgements, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them and a force in urging them' (Bassett 1987 p.53). A key issue is what is the preferred balance of Dunn's cycles? Educators, to their professional discomfort, have recently experienced the tyranny of insistence on economic rationalism; it has been partly sapping their commitment. Perhaps those of us with imaginings of a more inclusive world view should also insist.

...oOo...

REFERENCES

Australian Schools Commission 1973
Schools in Australia
Australian Government Publishing Service,
Canberra

Australian Schools Commission 1979
Annual Report 1979 p.3
Australian Government Publishing Service,
Canberra

Bassett, G W Postscript in My fifty years in education. Queensland: Queensland Institute for Educational Administration Inc., 1987, p.53

Birch IFk
Education and the External Affairs
Power: Implications for the Governance of Australian Schools.
The Australian Journal of Education Vol. 27 No. 3 1983 pp 234-239

Commonwealth Department of Education, 1967
Annual Report of the Commonwealth Department of Education p.28

Commonwealth Schools Commission 1983
Participation and Equity in Australian Schools
Canberra Printing, Canberra

Commonwealth Schools Commission 1984
Funding Policies for Australian Schools
Commonwealth Schools Commission, Canberra

Commonwealth Schools Commission 1985
Quality and Equality
Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra

Costello R & Dawkins J, Education: Progress and equality in J Reeves & K Thomson (Eds.) Labor essays 1983. Victoria: Dove, 1983, p.68

Dawkins John 1987
Higher education:A policy discussion paper, Canberra
AGPS December 1987

Dawkins John, 1988
Strengthening Australia's Schools:
A Consideration of the Focus and Content of Schooling

Dunn, W N Glossary in Public policy analysis: An introduction. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice-Hall, 1981, p.357-358

Elazar D J
Federalism in D.L. Sells (Ed) International Encyclopedia of the Social Services
London Collier-McMillan 1968 Vol. 5 p.353-367

Horne, D Think-or perish!: Towards a confident and productive Australia.
In Future, September 1988, 8, 21-22

Keeves J P and Mathews J K
Renewal in Australian Education - a changing prospect in J V D'Cruz and P J Sheehan (Eds)
The Renewal of Australian Schools
Australian Council for Educational Research, 1978 Ch. 11 p.185-201

Kemmis S & Rizvi F
Issues and conclusions: Dilemmas of Reform in
Dilemmas of Reform Geelong, Victoria
Deakin University 1987 pp 337

Maslen G Signs of improvement but so much
to be done
The Age November 15 1988 pp 26

Moran Beth 1980
The Establishment of a National Curriculum Development
Centre - Curriculum Development Centre - Canberra p.54

Pophewitz T S, Tabachnick B R & Whelage G
Social Reform and institutional life in
The Myth of Educational Reform: A study of school responses to a program
of change Madison: University of Wisconsin Press 1982 pp 4-5

Quality of Education Review Committee 1985
Quality of Education in Australia
Report of the Review Committee
Australian Government Publishing Service,
Canberra

Schools Commission 1979
Schools Commission Report for 1980

Schools Commission 1981
Schools Commission Report for 1980 p.102

Report for the Triennium 1982-1984
Commonwealth Schools Commission, Canberra

Spaull Andrew 1987
A History of the Australian Education Council 1936-1986
Allen and Unwin, Sydney

Stephen Sir Ninian 1989
Address to National Press Club January 25, 1989
On Being an Australian

... oOo ...